

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

Low Pass Road Closure

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum entitled "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this worksheet and the "Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet" located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

A. **BLM Office:** Eugene EA# OR 094-EA-01-09/DR

Proposed Action Title/Type: Close OHV dirt road and remove culvert, because of environmental damage.

Location of Proposed Action: T16SR7WSecs1 & 12, Long Tom Watershed

Description of the Proposed Action: The road will be obliterated using an excavator. The road surface will be recontoured and subsoiled and mounded with trees or slash. The road will be bermed and barricaded including the use of boulders. One medium fill culvert will be removed and side slopes will be laid back.

Applicant (if any): Cooperative project between State Parks, Blachly Lane and BLM.

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Eugene District RMP/ROD

Date Approved June 1995 as amended January 2001

Other document** Long Tom Watershed Analysis & Transportation Management Plan

Date Approved October 2000

Other document** EA # OR 094-EA-01-09/DR

Date Approved July 2001

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

X The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Aquatic Conservation Objectives
Cooperate with State, Federal and County Agencies

Manage roads to meet the needs identified under other resource objectives

_____ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

Not Applicable

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment for Long Tom Watershed Transportation Management Plan Implementation # OR 094-EA-01-09, July 2001.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

U.S. Fish and Wildlife 2001

Consultation on Essential Fish Habitat and Endangered Species Act for Upper Willamette Spring Chinook was not necessary (lack of suitable habitat).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

Documentation includes analysis of unknown & uninventoried miles of abandoned native surface roads that have been reopened by OHV use. These roads may be resource concerns and will be closed in areas where resource damage is occurring.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

Alternatives are appropriate to the Proposed Action. Non-maintained roads present a liability for both natural resources and public safety. If the road is not closed environmental damage will increase with OHV use.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

The existing analysis and conclusions are adequate. To meet ACS objectives, these OHV impacted areas will have to be closed.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

The analysis of impacts is adequately described using Best Management Practices and the most current scientific knowledge available.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

Direct and indirect impacts remain the same. Watershed wide analysis of impacts on road closures that are causing environmental degradation has been conducted. Sedimentation to streams does not meet ACS objectives.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

If the Proposed Action is not implemented, cumulative impacts to the ACS objectives will continue. Sedimentation to streams will continue to increase in this area from continued OHV use.

7. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes

Both EA and FONSI were advertised July 11, 2001, for a 15-day public review in the Eugene Register Guard. Mailings were sent and comment letters received and responded to.

E. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Karin Baitis	Soil Scientist	Soils
Gary Hoppe	Environmental Coordinator	Planning

F. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

Design features for road closures are included in the Long Tom Watershed Transportation Management Plan EA which adequately address mitigation concerns, see attached pages 2, 3 and 4 of the EA.

CONCLUSION

☐ Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

Steven A. Calish
Signature of the Responsible Official

6/19/02
Date